



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,465	04/24/2001	Seth Haberman	0813808.12502	5373
545 7590 01/21/2010				
IP Patent Docketing				
K&L GATES LLP				
599 Lexington Avenue				
33rd Floor				
New York, NY 10022-6030				
EXAMINER				
VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2424				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/21/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/841,465

**Applicant(s)**

HABERMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL VAN HANDEL

**Art Unit**

2424

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment filed 11/10/2009. Claims **1-19** are pending. Claims **1, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16,** and **19** are amended. Claims **20, 21** are canceled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments regarding claims **1, 16,** and **19**, filed 11/10/2009, have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims **1, 16,** and **19**, the applicant argues that Ficco does not disclose creating a personalized advertisement template comprising a plurality of media slots. The applicant specifically argues that Ficco discloses adapting an already-made advertisement by replacing a portion or segment of the advertisement with a selected ad segment and that this is fundamentally different than the method and system of creating a personalized advertisement by inserting multiple media segments into a template to create a customized advertisement. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner first notes that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., inserting multiple segments into a template to create a completely customized advertisement) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). That is, claims 1, 16, and 19 recite that a plurality of different media segments are insertable into at least one of the slots, but the examiner fails to find a recitation that multiple segments are inserted into the template. The

examiner interprets a personalized advertisement template as a template for an ad that will be personalized for a user. Ficco discloses taking a prescheduled advertisement and replacing at least a portion of the advertisement with an ad segment more directly targeting a viewer, such as an ad for a local General Motors dealer (p. 6, paragraph 84). As such, the examiner interprets the entire advertisement to be an advertisement template, which contains at least one segment of video content from the original advertisement and at least one segment of new video content from a replacement segment. The examiner fails to see how this is fundamentally different than “creating a personalized advertisement template comprising a plurality of media slots in sequence, wherein a plurality of different media segments are insertable into at least one of said slots and wherein each of the different media segments is a portion of a personalized advertisement,” as currently claimed.

Further regarding claims **1**, **16**, and **19**, the applicant argues that claims 1, 16, and 19 require assembly of a personalized advertisement by inserting media segments that are simultaneously streamed and are synchronized to begin and end at the same time into an advertisement template. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., media segments ... are synchronized to begin and end at the same time into an advertisement template) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). That is, the claims recite that the media segments are synchronized to begin and end at “substantially” the same time. Ficco discloses that the ad segment may have a length equal to or less than the time segment corresponding to the originally broadcast advertisement. The

synchronization detector detects the beginning of the originally broadcast advertisement and replaces the ad segment at the beginning of the time slot or a variable time within the time slot, depending on whether the segment has a length equal to or less than the original ad time segment (p. 3, paragraph 47). Since the ad segments are less than or equal to the length of the original ad segment, the examiner interprets this as being synchronized to begin and end at substantially the same time, as currently claimed.

Still further regarding claims **1**, **16**, and **19**, the applicant argues that there is no streaming taking place in the Ficco system at all and that the Ficco system does not teach how to handle or synchronize streaming media segments are required by Applicant's claims. Ficco discloses sending the advertising segments over a designated channel or point-to-point feed (p. 3, paragraphs 37, 38). As noted previously, Ficco also discloses synchronizing the beginning and ending of advertising segments within the advertisement based on the length of each segment. As noted in the Office Action below, Ficco does not specifically disclose that the plurality of data streams are transmitted simultaneously. Klosterman et al. discloses systems and methods for substituting alternative video and/or audio signals and/or graphics and/or text to be displayed on a viewer's television monitor for the video and/or audio signals that would otherwise be displayed according to the channel to which the viewer has tuned the television set (see Abstract). Klosterman et al. further discloses providing alternative advertisements on separate simultaneously broadcast television channels, so that the receiver can tune between the different channels to receive content best suited for a particular viewer (p. 2, paragraphs 31, 32; p. 4, paragraphs 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the ad segment transmission of Ficco to be simultaneously

transmitted on alternate channels with the original broadcast, such as that taught by the substitution system of Klosterman et al. in order to save storage space. Since Ficco discloses determining at which time to begin and end advertisement segments based on their length and Klosterman et al. discloses switching between channels with alternate ads at the beginning and end of an original advertisement, the examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to switch between ad segments at variable times as taught by Ficco, but by switching channels at those times to pick up alternate ad segments, such as that taught by Klosterman et al. in order to save storage space.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims **1-5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficco in view of Klosterman et al.

Referring to claims **1, 13, 16, and 19**, Ficco discloses a method/system for allowing the creation of a plurality of personalized advertisements to be viewed by an intended audience (see Abstract), comprising:

- creating a personalized advertisement template comprising a plurality of media slots in sequence (originally broadcast advertisement), wherein a plurality of different media segments are insertable into at least one of said slots and wherein each of the

different media segments is a portion of a personalized advertisement (p. 1, paragraph 9; p. 2, paragraphs 23, 28, 35; p. 3, paragraph 47), each of the plurality of different media segments comprising one of: an audio segment (p. 4, paragraph 55), a video segment (p. 4, paragraphs 60, 61), a graphics segment (p. 4, paragraphs 58-59), a rendering segment (p. 4, paragraphs 54, 57), and a segment of last minute information (p. 4, paragraph 60);

- transmitting a plurality of data streams to a receiving unit, each data stream delivering a different one of said plurality of media segments for said at least one of said slots (p. 2, 3, paragraphs 36-38), wherein said media segments are synchronized to begin and end at substantially the same time (p. 3, paragraphs 45-47; p. 5, paragraphs 63-65, 75); and
- transmitting content selection information regarding content of said plurality of data streams to said receiving unit, said information including switch times for said plurality of synchronized media segments, wherein said receiving unit uses said content selection information to switch between said plurality of data streams to retrieve at least one of said media segments for each of said slots, to generate a customized broadcast transmission stream, thereby assembling said personalized advertisement (p. 2, paragraph 36; p. 3, paragraphs 45, 47; p. 5, paragraphs 63, 72, 75).

Ficco further discloses replacing an entire originally broadcast advertisement with a selected ad segment (p. 3, paragraph 46). Ficco does not specifically disclose that the plurality of data streams are transmitted simultaneously. Klosterman et al. discloses systems and methods for

substituting alternative video and/or audio signals and/or graphics and/or text to be displayed on a viewer's television display monitor for the video and/or audio signals that would otherwise be displayed according to the channel to which the viewer has tuned the television set (see Abstract). Klosterman et al. further discloses providing alternative advertisements on separate simultaneously broadcast television channels, so that the receiver can tune between the different channels to receive content best suited for a particular viewer (p. 2, paragraphs 31, 32; p. 4, paragraphs 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the ad segment transmission of Ficco to be simultaneously transmitted on alternate channels with the original broadcast, such as that taught in the video substitution system of Klosterman et al. in order to save storage space.

Referring to claim **2**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said receiving unit selects among said plurality of data streams in real time (on-the-fly)(Ficco p. 1, paragraph 7).

Referring to claim **3**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said personalized advertisement is viewed by a viewer as it is assembled (adapted on-the-fly as it is being broadcast)(Ficco p. 1, paragraphs 7, 9, 13; p. 2, paragraph 27; & p. 3, paragraphs 46, 47).

Referring to claim **4**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said receiving unit selects among said plurality of data streams based on said content selection information and information about a viewer who will view said personalized advertisement (Ficco p. 1, paragraphs 11, 12; p. 2, paragraph 26; p. 3, paragraphs 39, 40, 45-47; p. 4, paragraphs 58, 59; & p. 6, paragraphs 85-89).



Referring to claim **5**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 4, further including providing a data stream with a default personalized advertisement to allow said receiving unit to display said default personalized advertisement without selecting between said plurality of data streams (Ficco p. 3, paragraph 46; p. 5, paragraphs 71-74; & Fig. 5).

Referring to claim **8**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said segments are incomplete parts of said personalized advertisement (Ficco p. 1, paragraph 9 & p. 3, paragraph 47).

Referring to claim **9**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said receiving unit is a set top box (Ficco p. 1, paragraph 8).

Referring to claims **12** and **18**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method/system of claims 9 and 16, respectively, wherein said set top box momentarily switches from a first digital data stream to a second digital data stream to play out said personalized advertisement (Ficco p. 5, paragraph 75).

Referring to claim **15**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further including a plurality of templates for creating said personalized advertisements, wherein said templates include video sequence templates and audio sequence templates (Ficco p. 4, paragraph 62).

5. Claim **6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficco in view of Klosterman et al. and further in view of Ten Kate et al.

Referring to claim **6**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1. Klosterman et al. does not disclose that the plurality of data streams are MPEG encoded data streams. Ten Kate et al. discloses encoding video streams in MPEG-2 (col. 3, l. 39-41, 61-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the transmission channels in the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. to be MPEG encoded, such as that taught by Ten Kate et al. in order to achieve a higher compression rate.

6. Claims **7, 10, 11, 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficco in view of Klosterman et al. and further in view of Picco et al.

Referring to claim **7**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1. The combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. does not specifically teach that the plurality of data streams are multiplexed into a transport stream. Picco et al. discloses multiplexing live television feeds 106, local content streams 108 and various other signals into a digital data stream that is then transmitted to a user (col. 8, l. 56-67 & Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the transmission channels in the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. to be multiplexed into a digital data stream, such as that taught by Picco et al. in order to provide individualized local content in a digital stream by transmitting to the user a single multiplexed data stream (Picco et al. col. 2, l. 42-44).

Referring to claims **10, 11, and 17**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method/system of claims 9 and 16. The combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al.

further teaches that the invention can receive analog television and digital television (Ficco p. 2, 3, paragraphs 37, 38). The combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. still further discloses switching advertisements in response to a channel change command in the vertical blanking interval (VBI)(Ficco p. 2, 3, paragraphs 36, 37 & Klosterman et al. p. 3, paragraph 38). The combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. does not specifically teach that the set top box momentarily switches from an analog data stream to a digital data stream to play out said personalized advertisement triggered by VBI data. Picco et al. discloses a set top box 120 (Fig. 7) that can receive both analog data streams and digital data streams (col. 14, l. 62-67). Picco et al. further discloses that the set top box 120 activates a web browser in response to a user selection when the user sees a television advertisement, which references a particular web site (col. 14, l. 17-41 & Fig. 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the VBI triggered advertisement switching of Klosterman et al. to include switching from an analog stream to a digital stream to display advertising information, such as that taught by Picco et al. in order to provide a television viewer with advertising from the Internet.

7. Claim **14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficco in view of Klosterman et al. and further in view of Kunkel et al.

Referring to claim **14**, the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. teaches the method of claim 1. The combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. does not specifically teach including transition segments, which are inserted into a personalized advertisement between segments. Kunkel et al. discloses encoding video streams in MPEG1 or MPEG2. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the transmission channels in the combination of Ficco and Klosterman et al. to be MPEG encoded, such as that taught by Kunkel et al. in order to achieve a higher compression rate. Kunkel et al. further discloses sending I-frames continuously at the beginning of targeted ads, so that the set top box tuners can quickly acquire the signal. Similarly, a continuous stream of I-frames is provided for the last few seconds of the advertisement to enable the tuners to quickly reacquire the original channel once the advertisement has concluded (p. 4, paragraph 31). It would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the combination of Klosterman et al. and Kunkel et al. to include continuously sending I-frames at the beginning and end of advertisements, such as that taught by Kunkel et al. in order to facilitate seamless transitions between advertisements and original programming (Kunkel et al. p. 4, paragraph 31).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL VAN HANDEL whose telephone number is (571)272-5968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Kelley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2424

MV